IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDIATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.4452 OF 1998

Ramakant s/o Ramrao Deshmukh .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4453 OF 1998

Madhav Dattatrayarao Painjane .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4454 OF 1998

Shankar Gurbasappa Tenkale .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4455 OF 1998

Bhagwat Laxmanrao Kale .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4456 OF 1998

Kashinath Eknath Dabhade .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4457 OF 1998

Shankar Punjabrao Denge .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor

General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4458 OF 1998

Zulfekar Hussain Kasam Ali .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WRIT PETITION NO.4459 OF 1998

Mohd.Rasheed Mohd. Sattar .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4460 OF 1998

Shrinivas Radhakrishna Joshi .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4461 OF 1998

Pandarinath Pandurang Waghmare .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4462 OF 1998

Sumant Dattatraya Joshi .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4463 OF 1998

Jeevan Chindambar Rao Ganorkar .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4464 OF 1998

Ramchandra Govind Sinnarkar .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4465 OF 1998

Gajanan Pandurang Kadekar .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.4466 OF 1998

Santram Wamanrao Dahale .. Petitioner.
Vs.
The Comptroller & Auditor
General and Others .. Respondents.

None for the petitioner
None for the respondents.

CORAM : B.H.MARLAPALLE & D.B.BHOSALE, JJ.
DATED : APRIL 3, 2006.

P.C:

. These group of petitions have been transferred from the Aurangabad bench of this Court. The petitioners' were the State Government employees working under respondent no.4 as Junior Clerks initially. They came to be confirmed as Senior Clerks sometime in 1972 as per order dated

10.11.1975. They came to be appointed as unqualified Divisional Accountants by respondent no.3 and while they continued to work as such the reversion order dated 11.1.1998 came to be issued by respondent no.3 and the petitioners were sent back to the office of respondent no.4. This order of reversion has been challenged in these petitions.

2. The petitioners being the State Government employees and on deputation in the office of the Accountant General at Nagpur ought to have moved the Administrative Tribunal but they approached this Court and while granting Rule there was no interim relief granted in their favour. By the order dated 29.11.1989 this court recorded that the respondents shall be at liberty to approached the Administrative Tribunal as this Court has no jurisdiction. By further order dated 9.10.1991 this Court recorded prima facie view that the writ petition may not be transferred to the Administrative Tribunal.

3. Similarly placed employees had moved Aurangabad Bench few years back and the petitions were not admitted. The petitions were either transferred to the Administrative Tribunal or they

were allowed to be withdrawn by following the law laid down in the case of **L.Chandra Kumar Vs. Union of India and Others AIR 1997 SC 1125**.

4. With the passage of time challenge to the reversion order impugned in these petitions does not survive and for other reliefs of promotion etc. the petitioners have a remedy to approach either the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal or Central Administrative Tribunal as the case may be. Hence the petitions are dismissed as infructuous. Interim order, if any, stands vacated. Rule discharged. No costs.

(D.B.BHOSALE, J.) **(B.H.MARLAPALLE, J.)**